

Clinical Update

Naval Postgraduate Dental School Navy Medicine Manpower, Personnel, Training and Education Command 8901 Wisconsin Ave Bethesda, Maryland 20889-5600

Vol. 33, No. 2

Strategies for Achieving Profound Pulpal Anesthesia in the Mandible Richard Campbell, CAPT, DC, USN, John Allemang, CAPT, DC, USN (ret), Patricia Tordik, CAPT, DC, USN

Introduction

Studies on inferior alveolar nerve blocks (IANB) suggest that it is only 19% to 56% effective in achieving profound pulpal anesthesia in teeth with irreversible pulpitis (1). This may be explained by mandibular nerve anatomy and physiology. Nerves in the periphery of the mandibular bundle supply molar teeth while those closer to the core innervate incisors (2). Anesthetic solution is unable to diffuse into the nerve trunk in concentrations high enough to completely block impulses, resulting in higher anesthetic failure rates for mandibular anterior teeth (2-4). Neurons associated with inflamed tissue have altered resting potentials and decreased excitability thresholds (5). Tetrodotoxin-resistant sodium channels have increased expression in irreversibly inflamed pulp and are less sensitive to local anesthetics (6). Pre-existing pain and apprehension, the patient's response to pain and the dentist's approach may also lower pain thresholds (7,8).

The Gow-Gates (GG) and Vazirani-Akinosi (VA) injections are touted as superior to the IANB, while comparative studies find no difference (4,9). Combining injections which target different sites along the mandibular nerve (e.g., an IANB with a GG or VA) may result in more profound anesthesia (9,10). Currently, there is no data to confirm this.

The type of anesthetic used does not significantly affect the outcome. Solutions of 4% articaine are found to be no more effective than 2% lidocaine (1:100,000 epi) (11,12). Likewise, 3% mepivacaine and 4% prilocaine solutions are found to be as effective as 2% lidocaine with epinephrine for 55 minutes of pulpal anesthesia (13,14). Also, no significant difference is found between using one versus two cartridges of 2% lidocaine (1:100,000 epi) (4,15).

Lip numbness occurs within 5-9 minutes of injection. Pulpal anesthesia in mandibular teeth takes 15-16 minutes, or longer, 19-27% of the time (13,14). Administering an IANB over 60 seconds results in a higher anesthetic success rate and patients report less pain than if the injection is given over 15 seconds (16). Confirming pulpal anesthesia with a negative response to cold or an electric pulp test (EPT) is more reliable than lip numbness (4,17,18). If a slowly delivered block and adequate time fail to produce pulpal anesthesia, the following **supplemental injections** should be considered.

Infiltration

Buccal infiltrations of 2% lidocaine (1:100,000 epi) or 4% articaine (1:100,000 epi) after IANB significantly increase anesthetic success in mandibular first molars from 59% to 71% and 88%, respectively (19). However, a study of patients with irreversible pulpitis reports supplemental buccal infiltrations of articaine are 58% successful (20). Combining labial and lingual infiltrations of lidocaine is more effective in attaining pulpal anesthesia in the anterior mandible than either a labial or lingual injection used alone (21,22).

Incisive Nerve Block

An incisive nerve block is excellent for anesthetizing premolars and when used in combination with an IANB, increases the success of first molar anesthesia to 70% (23). It has limited use for anesthetizing mandibular incisors (23). As a primary technique, it is up to 94% successful only if the block is delivered with the needle positioned to enter the foramen (24).

Intraosseous

Intraosseous (IO) injections deliver local anesthetic solution directly into the cancellous bone adjacent to the tooth to be anesthetized. Use of the Stabident® (Fairfax Dental Inc., Miami, FL) or X-tip® (DENTSPLY Maillefer, Tulsa, OK) intraosseous system produces high rates of profound anesthesia. The onset is nearly immediate (25) and the duration, 90% for 60 minutes (26) and 95% for 20 minutes (27) in first molars, compares favorably with standard nerve blocks. In a study of posterior teeth with irreversible pulpitis, supplemental mandibular IO injections are 90% successful in obtaining complete pulpal anesthesia (28). Reisman et al., reports that supplemental IO injections with 3% mepivacaine increases successful anesthesia from 25% for IANB alone to 80% in mandibular teeth with irreversible pulpitis. A second cartridge of 3% mepivacaine increases this success rate to 98% (29). There are side effects associated with IO injections. Patients may develop swelling or exudate at the site of perforation, likely due to overheating the bone (30). Other patients (5%-15%) report their tooth "feels high" to mastication for a few days (26,30). And 67% of patients experience an increase in heart rate of 12-32 bpm when epinephrine-containing local anesthetics are given IO (31). Although a transient increase in heart rate is not likely to be clinically significant in healthy patients, use of a 3% mepivacaine solution without a vasoconstrictor is advised for patients with heart problems (31).

Intraligamentary

Another type of IO anesthesia (32), intraligamentary (IL) injections, can be highly effective. In a study of patients with irreversible pulpitis, this injection type is 74% successful on first attempt, and 95% successful on a second attempt (33). The duration of anesthesia is shorter than other IO injections due to the low volume of anesthetic delivered. Though no long-term deleterious effects on the pulp are observed (34), 36% to 49% of patients report soreness after IL injections (35). Computer-Controlled Local Anesthetic Delivery (C-CLADTM) systems, The Wand/Compudent[®] and STA (Single Tooth Anesthesia) System[®] (Milestone Scientific Inc, Livingston, NJ), are useful in delivering IL anesthesia (36,37).

Intrapulpal

In a small percentage of mandibular posterior teeth with irreversible pulpitis, supplemental injections fail to produce profound anesthesia (4). This is an indication for an intrapulpal (IP) injection. Depositing anesthetic passively into the chamber is ineffective. The anesthetic will not diffuse throughout the pulp. The type of anesthetic is unimportant. Strong back pressure is responsible for producing

anesthesia and similar results can be achieved using sterile saline versus a local anesthetic solution (38,39). Administered properly, an IP injection produces immediate, profound, pulpal anesthesia for 15-20 minutes (38,39). Special syringes or needles are not required, but it can be very painful and is recommended only as a last resort.

Conclusion

Attaining profound pulpal anesthesia in mandibular posterior teeth is likely the most difficult dental anesthesia challenge. Although 100% local anesthetic success is currently unachievable, there is excellent clinical evidence that with proper knowledge, technical skill and a systematic approach, profound anesthesia may be attained in up to 98% of patients.

References

- Bigby J, Reader A, Nusstein J, Beck M, Weaver J. Articaine for supplemental intraosseous anesthesia in patients with irreversible pulpitis. J Endod 2006;32:1044-7
- Rood JP. The nerve supply of the mandibular incisor region. Brit Dent J 1977;143:227-30.
- 3. Nusstein JM, Reader A, Drum M. Local anesthesia strategies for the patient with a "hot" tooth, Dent Clin North Am, 2010;54:237-47.
- Reader, A. Taking the Pain out of Restorative Dentistry and Endodontics: Current Thoughts and Treatment Options to Help Patients Achieve Profound Anesthesia. AAE Colleagues for Excellence, Winter 2009:1-7.
- Modaresi J, Dianat O, Soluti A. Effect of pulp inflammation on nerve impulse quality with or without anesthesia. J Endod 2008;34:438-41.
- Roy M, Nakanishi T. Differential properties of tetrodotoxin-sensitive and tetrodoxin-resistant sodium channels in rat dorsal root ganglion neurons. J Neurosci 1992;12:2104-11.
- Walton RE, Torabinejad M. Managing local anesthesia problems in the endodontic patient. J Am Dent Assoc 1992;123:97-102.
- Rosenberg PA, Amin KG, Zibari Y, Lin LM, J Endod 2007;33:403-5.
 Comparison of 4% Articaine with 1:100,000 epinephrine and 2% lidocaine with 1:100,000 epinephrine when used as a supplemental anesthetic. J Endod 2007;33:403-5.
- Malamed SF. The Gow-Gates mandibular block evaluation after 4275 cases. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol 1981;51:463-7.
- Meechan JG. How to overcome failed local anaesthesia. British Dental Journal 1999;186:15-20.
- Mikesell P, Nusstein J, Reader A, Beck M, Weaver J.A comparison of articaine and lidocaine for inferior alveolar nerve blocks. J Endod 2005;31:265-70.
- Claffey E, Reader A, Nusstein J, Beck M, Weaver J. Anesthetic efficacy of articaine for inferior alveolar nerve blocks in patients with irreversible pulpitits. J Endod 2004;30:568-71.
- McLean C, Reader A, Beck M, Meyers WJ. An evaluation of 4% prilocaine and 3% mepivacaine compared to 2% lidocaine (1:1000 epinephrine) for inferior alveolar nerve block. J Endod 1993;19:146-50.
- 14. Hinkley S, Reader A, Beck M, Meyers W. An evaluation of 4% prilocaine with 1:200,000 epinephrine and 2% mepivacaine with levonordefrin compared to 2% lidocaine with 1:100,000 epinephrine for inferior alveolar nerve block. Anesth Prog 1991;38:84-89.
- Nusstein J, Reader A, Beck M. Anesthetic efficacy of different volumes of lidocaine with epinephrine for inferior alveolar nerve blocks. Gen Dent 2002:50:372-5.
- Kanaa MD, Meechan JG, Corbett IP, Whitworth JM. Speed of injection influences efficacy of inferior alveolar nerve blocks: A double-blind randomized controlled trial in volunteers. J Endod 2006;32:919-23.
- 17. Certosimo A, Archer R. A clinical evaluation of the electric pulp tester as an indicator of local anesthesia. Oper Dent 1996;21:25-30.
- Hsiao-Wu G, Susarla SM, White RR. Use of the cold test as a measure of pulpal anesthesia during endodontic therapy: a randomized, blinded, placebocontrolled clinical trial. J Endod 2007;33:406-10.
- Haase A, Nusstein RA, Beck M, Drum M. Comparative anesthetic efficacy of articaine versus lidocaine as a supplemental buccal infiltration of the mandibular first molar following IAN block. J Am Dent Assoc 2008; 139. 1228-35.
- Matthews M, Drum M, Reader A, Nusstein, Beck M. Articaine for supplemental buccal infiltration in patients with irreversible pulpitis when the inferior alveolar nerve block fails. J Endod 2009;35:343-6.
- Foster W, Drum M, Reader A, Beck M. Anesthetic efficacy of buccal and lingual infiltrations of lidocaine following and inferior alveolar nerve block in mandibular posterior teeth. Anesth Prog 2007;54:163-9.
- Meechan J, Ledvinka J.Pulpal anesthesia for madibular central incisor teeth: a comparison of infiltration and intraligamentary injections. Int Endod J 2002;35.

- Nist R, Reader A, Beck M, Meyers WJ. An evaluation of the incisive nerve block and combination inferior alveolar and incisive nerve blocks in mandibular anesthesia. J Endod 1992;18.
- Joyce AP, Donnelly JC. Evaluation of the effectiveness and comfort of incisive anesthesia given inside or outside the mental foramen. J Endod 1993;19.
- Nusstein J, Kennedy S, Reader A, Beck M, Weaver J. Anesthetic efficacy of the supplemental X-tip intraosseous injection in patients with irreversible pulpitis. J Endod 2003;29:724-8.
- Dunbar D, Reader A, Nist R, Beck M, Meyers W. Anesthetic efficacy of the intraosseous injection after an inferior alveolar nerve block. J Endod 1996;22:481-6.
- Reitz J, Reader A, Nist R, Beck M, Meyers WJ. Anesthetic efficacy of the intraosseous injection of 0.9 mL of 2% lidocaine (1:100,000 epinephrine) to augment an inferior alveolar nerve block. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod 1998;86.
- Nusstein J, Reader A, Nist R, Beck M, Meyers WJ. Anesthetic efficacy of the supplemental intraosseous injection of 2% lidocaine with 1:100,000 epinephrine in irreversible pulpitis. J Endod 1998;24:487-91.
- Reisman D, Reader A, Nist R, Beck M, Weaver J. Anesthetic efficacy of the supplemental intraosseous injection of 3% mepivacaine in irreversible pulpitis. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod 1997;84:676-82.
- Gallatin J, Nusstein J, Reader A, Beck M, Weaver J. A comparison of injection pain and postoperative pain of two intraosseous anesthetic techniques. Anesth Prog 2003;50.
- Replogle K, Reader A, Nist R, Beck M, Weaver J, Meyers WJ. Cardiovascular effects of intraosseous injections of 2% lidocaine with 1;100,000 epinephrine and 3% mepivacaine. J Am Dent Assoc 1999;130.
- Smith GN, Walton RE. Periodontal ligament injection: distribution of injected solutions. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol 1983;55:232-8.
- Cohen HP, Dah BY, Spangberg LSW. Endodontic anesthesia in mandibular molar: a clinical study. J Endod 1993;19:370-3.
- Torabinejad M, Peters DL, Peckham N, Rentchler LR, Richardson J. Electron microscopic changes in human pulps after intraligamental injections. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol 1993; 76:219-24.
- D'Souza J, Walton R, Peterson L. Periodontal ligament injection: An evaluation of extent of anesthesia and postinjection discomfort. J Am Dent 1987;114.
- Nusstein J, Claffey E, Reader A, Beck M Weaver J. Anesthetic effectiveness of the supplemental intraligamentary injection, administered with a computercontrolled local anesthetic delivery system, in patients with irreversible pulpitis. J Endod 2005;31.
- Hockam M. Single-tooth anesthesia: Pressure-sensing technology provides innovative advancement in the field of dental local anesthesia. Compendium 2007;28.
- Birchfield J, Rosenberg P. Role of the anesthetic solution in intrapulpal anesthesia. J Endod 1975;1:26-7.
- VanGheluwe J, Walton R. Intrapulpal injection factors related to effectiveness. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Path Oral Radiol Endod 1997;19:38-40.

CAPT Campbell is a second year resident; CAPT (ret) Allemang is an Affiliate Professor and frequent lecturer on local anesthesia; CAPT Tordik is Professor and Chairman of Endodontics, Naval Postgraduate Dental School, Bethesda, MD.

The opinions contained in this article are the private ones of the authors and are not to be construed as official or reflecting the views of the Department of the Navy.

The mention of any brand names in this *Clinical Update* does not imply recommendation or endorsement by the Department of the Navy, Department of Defense, or the US Government.